REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 – 3, 6 - 27, 33, and 34 are pending.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation from claim 5 that the antistatic agent is an organic phosphate ester.

Claims 4 and 5 are canceled.

Claims 28 - 32 have been withdrawn.

By way of the Office Action mailed November 15, 2007, the pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and thus unpatentable over Baldwin (US 4,411,928) in view of some combination of Coates et al. (US 4,082,887), Gilbert (US 4,000,233), Weipert (US 4,169,062), and/or Potts (US 5,145,727). This rejection is respectfully **traversed** to the extent that it may apply to the presently presented claims at least for the reason that the cited references do not teach or suggest all the elements of the pending claims.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of treating a substrate to improve the alcohol repellency. The method includes the step of contacting a first side of a substrate with a treatment solution comprising an ionic fluoropolymer, a monovalent salt, and less than about 0.05 weight percent by weight of an antistatic agent, followed by the step of applying an antistatic agent to the substrate prior to full curing of the fluoropolymer so that the antistat does not interfere with the water repellency of the first side. The antistatic agent is an organic phosphate ester. To teach all the elements of claim 1, a reference must teach or suggest a first contact to a first side of a substrate with an ionic fluoropolymer treatment solution and a **subsequent** application of an **organic phosphate ester** prior to full curing of the fluoropolymer so as to **not interfere with the water repellency of the first side.**

The office action suggests that a repeated application (not disclosed) of the coating composition of Baldwin, in view of Coates, renders Applicants' claims obvious. However, neither Baldwin nor Coates teaches or suggests the use of an antistatic agent that is an organic phosphate ester. Additionally, neither Baldwin nor Coates teaches a subsequent application of an organic phosphate ester that does not interfere with the water repellency of the side of the substrate to

which the first treatment solution was applied. In particular, Baldwin teaches using a monovalent salt as an antistatic agent in the same bath with the water repellent fluorochemical.

The office action cites Gilbert and Weipert to show that organic phosphate esters are known antistatic agents. However, combining these references with Baldwin and Coates still does not render Applicants' claims obvious. Baldwin teaches preparing a single bath that includes fluorocarbon and antistat. Substitution of organic phosphate ester for the antistat in Baldwin would result in a bath having both the fluorocarbon and organic phosphate ester, leading to the same problems that Applicants' claims address, i.e., the negative impact that antistats can have on repellency properties. There is no teaching or suggestion in any of the references to separate the fluorocarbon and the organic phosphate ester into different application steps and apply them in such a way as to not allow the organic phosphate ester to interfere with the water repellency delivered by the initial fluorocarbon application step.

Similarly, claim 33 is directed to a method of improving the alcohol repellency of a nonwoven laminate by applying a topical treatment to a nonwoven substrate while minimizing any negative effect of the topical treatment on the water repellency of the nonwoven substrate. The method includes the step of contacting a first side of a nonwoven substrate with a treatment solution that does not include an organic phosphate ester, the treatment solution comprising water, from about 0.1 to about 1 weight percent of an ionic fluoropolymer or mixture thereof, and less than about 0.1 weight percent of a monovalent salt or mixture thereof. The initial treatment step is followed by the step of applying an antistatic agent selected from the group consisting of organic phosphate esters to the substrate prior to full curing of the fluoropolymer so that the antistat does not interfere with the water repellency of the first side.

It can be readily seen that the arguments above as applied to claim 1 further apply to claim 33. In that regard, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the obviousness rejection of claim 33.

For the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently presented claims are in form for allowance.

Please charge any prosecutional fees which are due to Kimberly-Clark Worldwide, Inc. deposit account number 11-0875.

The undersigned may be reached at: 770-587-8628.

Respectfully submitted,

SNOWDEN ET AL.

By: _____

Richard M. Shane
Registration No.: 50,921
Attorney for Applicant(s)

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I, Richard M. Shane, hereby certify that on April 15, 2008 this document is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (571) 273-8300.

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Richard M. Shane

Signature: _____